UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,974	07/09/2001	Shell Sterling Simpson	10007647-1	7274

7590	10/06/2005	

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO   80527-2400

EXAMINER
SINGH, SATWANT K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="3">Office Action Summary</td>
<td colspan="2">Application No.
09/901,974</td>
<td colspan="2">Applicant(s)
SIMPSON ET AL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">Examiner</td>
<td>Art Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">Satwant K. Singh</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 June 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 July 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is filed in response to the amendment filed on 16 June 2005.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1-38 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-12, 14-18, 20, 22-24, 26-29, 31-34, 36, and 38 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson (US

2002/0143915) in view of Salgado et al. (US 6,762,857).

5.   Regarding Claim 1, Mathieson teaches a method for providing queue

management and production device status in a distributed environment, comprising:

placing production data received from a client in a queue (job is sent from computer 14

over a network 18 to the server queue 24) (page 1, paragraph [0014], [0015]);

generating a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing the

production data held in the queue (queue manager 15 allows a user or administrator to

manage jobs 17 in the two queues) (page 1, paragraph [0015]), the production data to

be delivered to a production device (user interface 16 provides information on the jobs

17 held in each of the two queues 24 and 28) (page 1, paragraph [0015]); presenting

the queue interface to the client (Fig. 1, user interface 16) (page 1, paragraph [0015]);

generating a status interface for the production device (Fig, 2, status 32) (page 1,

paragraph 0016]); and presenting the status interface to the client (Figs. 1 and 2, status)

(page 1, paragraph [0015]).

Mathieson fails to teach a method for providing queue management and

production device status in a distributed environment, comprising: the production data

including print options for a target document identified by the client.

Salgado et al teach a method for providing queue management and production

device status in a distributed environment, comprising: the production data including

print options for a target document identified by the client (Fig. 7, print queue).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson with the teaching of

Salgado to include the print options for a target document in the queue (other fields 38

associated with the jobs) for the client to manage.

6.   Regarding Claim 2, Mathieson teaches a method, further comprising managing

the production data in the queue in accordance with instructions entered through the

queue interface (user can change the priority of the job simply by dragging the jobs to

different locations on the user interface (page 1, paragraph [0017], [0018]).

7.   Regarding Claim 4, Mathieson teaches a method, wherein the queue is capable

of containing production data directed to more than one production device (server

queue 24) (page 1, paragraph [0013]) and wherein the acts of generating and

presenting the status interface comprise generating and presenting the status interface

for a production device selected through the queue interface (Fig. 3, server 22, device 26) (jobs displayed according to the device where the job is currently residing) (pages 1 and 2, paragraph [0019]).

8.   Regarding Claim 5, Mathieson teaches a method, wherein the acts of generating and presenting the status interface for the production device comprise generating and presenting the status interface once the production data is delivered to the production device (Figs. 2 and 3, printing).

9.   Regarding Claim 6, Mathieson teaches a method, wherein the act of presenting the queue and status interfaces comprise generating and presenting a combined queue/status interface (Fig. 3, server 22, device 26) (jobs displayed according to the device where the job is currently residing) (pages 1 and 2, paragraph [0019]).

10.   Regarding Claim 8, Mathieson teaches a method for mediating access to production devices, comprising: acquiring an access request for a production device the access request originating form a client (processor 13 uses a User Interface (UI) 16 to receive user inputs) (page 1, paragraph [0012]); presenting to the client a production interface for the production device (user interface 16 provides information on the jobs 17 held in each of the two queues 24 and 28) (page 1, paragraph [0015]); placing in a queue production data received from the client and selected through the production interface (job is sent from computer 14 over a network 18 to the server queue 24) (page 1, paragraph [0014], [0015]); generating a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing the production data in the queue (queue manager 15 allows a user or administrator to manage jobs 17 in the two queues) (page 1, paragraph [0015]);

presenting the queue interface to the client (Figs. 1 and 2, status) (page 1, paragraph [0015]); generating a status interface for the production device; and presenting the status interface to the client (Fig, 2, status 32) (page 1, paragraph 0016]).

11.   Mathieson fails to teach a method, for mediating access to production devices, the interface having user accessible controls for selecting production data.

12.   Salgado et al teach a method, for mediating access to production devices, the interface having user accessible controls for selecting production data (Fig. 7, print queue).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson with the teaching of Salgado to include the print options for a target document in the queue for the user to access (other fields 38 associated with the jobs) for the client to manage.

13.   Claims 10, 16, 22, 28, and 33 are rejected for the same reason as claim 4.

14.   Claims 11, 17, 23, 31, and 36 are rejected for the same reason as claim 5.

15.   Claims 12, 18, 24, 29, and 34 are rejected for the same reason as claim 6.

16.   Claims 14 and 26 are rejected for the same reason as claim 1.

17.   Claims 15, 27, and 38 are rejected for the same reason as claim 2.

18.   Claims 20, and 32 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 8.

19.   Claims 3, 7, 9, 13, 19, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson and Salgado et al. as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Barnard et al. (US 6,920,506).

20.   Regarding Claim 3, Mathieson and Salgado et al fail to teach a method wherein

the acts of generating the queue and status interfaces comprise generating the queue

and status interfaces each in the form of a web page.

Barnard et al teach a method wherein the acts of generating the queue and

status interfaces comprise generating the queue and status interfaces each in the form

of a web page (Fig. 6, print queue web page 89) (col. 10, lines 5-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson and Salgado with the

teaching of Barnard to generate the print queue in the form of a web page to allow a

user to quickly and efficiently manage the print queue.

21.   Regarding Claim 7, Mathieson and Salgado et al fail to teach a method wherein

the act of generating the queue interface comprises generating the queue interface in

the form of a web page; the act of generating the status interface comprises generating

the status interface in the form of a web page; and the act of generating the combined

queue/status interface comprises generating the combined queue/status interface in the

form of a framed web page.

Barnard et al teach a method the act of generating the queue interface comprises

generating the queue interface in the form of a web page; the act of generating the

status interface comprises generating the status interface in the form of a web page;

and the act of generating the combined queue/status interface comprises generating the

combined queue/status interface in the form of a framed web page (Fig. 6, print queue

web page 89) (col. 10, lines 5-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson and Salgado with the teaching of Barnard to generate the print queue in the form of a web page to allow a user to quickly and efficiently manage the print queue.

22.   Claims 9 and 21 are rejected for the same reason as claim 3.

23.   Claims 13, 19, 25, 30, 35, and 37 are rejected for the same reason as claim 7.

Conclusion

24.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satwant K. Singh whose telephone number is (571)

272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am -

4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams can be reached on (571) 272-7471. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satwant K. Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2626

sks

KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER